

investigatory material including certain reciprocal investigations and counterintelligence information, which might alert a subject to the fact that an investigation of that individual is taking place, and the disclosure of which would weaken the on-going investigation, reveal investigatory techniques, and place confidential informants in jeopardy who furnished information under an express promise that the sources' identity would be held in confidence (or prior to the effective date of the Act, under an implied promise).

Dated: November 25, 1996.

L. M. Bynum,

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 96-30535 Filed 11-29-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-F

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Coast Guard

#### 33 CFR Part 110

[CGD07-96-017

RIN 2115-AA98

#### **Anchorage Areas; Ashley River, Charleston, SC; Correction**

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DOT.

**ACTION:** Correction to final regulations.

**SUMMARY:** This document contains corrections to the final regulations [FR Doc. 96-20018], which were published Wednesday, August 7, 1996, (61 FR 40993). The regulations related to the establishment of anchorage areas on the Ashley River, Charleston, South Carolina.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** September 6, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** CWO4 R.M. Webber, Project Officer, Marine Safety Office Charleston, Tel: (803) 724-7690.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Need for Correction

As published, the final regulations contain an error which requires correction for the proper establishment of the anchorage areas.

#### Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication on August 7, 1996, (61 FR 40993) of the final regulations [FR Doc. 96-20018], is corrected as follows:

#### **§ 110.72d [Corrected]**

On page 40994, in the second column, in § 110.72d, in paragraph (a), in the

seventh line, "32°46'43.7"N" is corrected to read "32°46'42.7"N".

Dated: October 25, 1996.

J.W. Lockwood,

*U.S. Coast Guard Commander, Seventh Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 96-30067 Filed 11-29-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

## LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

### Copyright Office

#### 37 CFR Parts 251, 252, 257, and 259

[Docket No. RM 94-1A]

#### **Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panels; Rules and Regulations**

**AGENCY:** Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

**ACTION:** Technical amendments.

**SUMMARY:** On December 7, 1994, the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress published final regulations governing the administration of royalty fee distribution proceedings and royalty rate adjustment proceedings for the statutory licenses. Over the past eighteen months, the Office tested these rules and identified areas which required minor adjustments or clarification. This notice makes non-substantive technical amendments to correct the identified problems.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 2, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Marilyn J. Kretsinger, Acting General Counsel, or Tanya M. Sandros, CARP Specialist, Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel, P.O. Box 70977, Southwest Station, Washington, D.C. 20024. Telephone: (202) 707-8380. Telefax: (202) 707-8366.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Copyright Office ("Office") of the Library of Congress issued the current regulations, see 37 CFR chapter II, subchapter B, governing the Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panels ("CARP") after an extensive rulemaking which began with a notice of proposed rulemaking, 59 FR 2550 (January 18, 1994), and concluded with the publication of the final regulations on December 7, 1994. 59 FR 63025 (December 7, 1994). During 1995 and 1996, these rules were used to conduct a CARP proceeding to determine the distribution of the 1990, 1991, and 1992 cable royalties; to initiate a second CARP proceeding to determine the distribution of the 1992, 1993, and 1994 digital audio recording technology (DART) royalties in the Musical Works

Funds; and to set the schedule for four rate setting proceedings.

In using the CARP rules to administer these proceedings, the Office identified some minor problems with the application of the current rules, which these non-substantive technical amendments correct. The amendments clarify ambiguous sections, harmonize discordant rules, and streamline the process, when possible, based on the experience gleaned over the past eighteen months.

#### Official Address

During the course of a CARP proceeding, interested parties file pleadings with the Copyright Office and the CARP. Although many of these pleadings are filed with the Copyright Office prior to the initiation of the CARP, the regulations do not instruct the parties where to file the pleading at the Copyright Office, if hand delivered. Therefore, § 251.1 is amended to address this omission by adding the official address of the Office of the Copyright General Counsel.

#### List of Arbitrators

The Librarian of Congress selects arbitrators for a CARP from a list of names generated from the nominations submitted to him by at least three professional arbitration associations. Section 251.3(a) allows the arbitration associations to submit new names each year and § 251.3(b) requires the Librarian to publish a list of qualified nominees after January 1 of each year.

The annual solicitation of new names from at least three arbitration associations and the review of the financial disclosure forms from the nominees, however, requires substantial time and effort on the part of the Librarian of Congress, the Copyright Office, and the nominating organizations. Likewise, the parties to a proceeding expend considerable time and expense in examining the background material for each potential arbitrator in preparing their objections under § 251.4 to listed arbitrators. But in spite of all the preliminary work, very few individuals on the list actually will have an opportunity to serve on a panel. In 1995, three individuals from a list of 77 names were chosen to serve on a single panel; and this year, no more than six individuals from a list of 36 nominees will be chosen to serve as a CARP arbitrator.

In consideration of the relatively small probability of using more than a handful of names from the list in any given year, the Office cannot justify the disproportionate amount of time and expense expended by the nominating